ATTACHMENT J.2

APPENDIX B

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION MEASUREMENT PLAN

Applicable to the Operation of

Ames Laboratory

Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11358

FY 2009

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND MEASUREMENT PLAN

FOR

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS OF THE

AMES LABORATORY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
AMES SITE OFFICE

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

This document, the Performance Evaluation and Measurement Plan (PEMP), primarily serves as DOE's Quality Assurance/Surveillance Plan (QASP) for the evaluation of Iowa State University (hereafter referred to as "the Contractor") performance regarding the management and operations of the Ames Laboratory (hereafter referred to as "the Laboratory") for the evaluation period from October 1, 2008, through September 30, 2009. The performance evaluation provides a standard by which to determine whether the Contractor is managerially and operationally in control of the Laboratory and is meeting the mission requirement and performance expectations/objectives of the Department as stipulated within this contract.

This document also describes the distribution of the total available performance-based fee and the methodology for determining the amount of fee earned by the Contractor as stipulated within the clauses entitled, "Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts," and "Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount." In partnership with the Contractor and other key customers, the Department of Energy (DOE) Headquarters (HQ) and the Site Office have defined the measurement basis that serves as the Contractor's performance-based evaluation and fee determination. The total available fee: for the period October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009 for Base Fee is $500,000 and Performance Fee is $335,000

The Performance Goals (hereafter referred to as Goals), Performance Objectives (hereafter referred to as Objectives) and set of Performance Measures and Targets (hereafter referred to as Performance Measures/Targets) for each Objective discussed herein were developed in accordance with contract expectations set forth within the contract. The Performance Measures for meeting the Objectives set forth within this plan have been developed in coordination with HQ program offices as appropriate. Except as otherwise provided for within the contract, the evaluation and fee determination will rest solely on the Contractor's performance within the Performance Goals and Objectives set forth within this plan.

The overall performance against each Objective of this performance plan, to include the evaluation of Performance Measures identified for each Objective, shall be evaluated jointly by the appropriate HQ office or major customer and the Site Office. This cooperative review methodology will ensure that the overall evaluation of the Contractor results in a consolidated DOE position taking into account specific Performance Measures as well as all additional information not otherwise identified via specific Performance Measures. The Site Office shall work closely with each HQ program office or major customer throughout the year in evaluating the Contractor's performance and will provide observations regarding programs and projects as well as other management and operation activities conducted by the Contractor throughout the year.

Section I provides information on how the performance rating (grade) for the Contractor, as well as how the performance-based incentives fee earned (if any) will be determined. As applicable, it also provides information on the award term eligibility requirements.

Section II provides the detailed information concerning each Goal, their corresponding Objectives, and Performance Measures of performance identified, along with the weightings assigned to each Goal and Objective and a table for calculating the final score for each Goal.

I. DETERMINING THE CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE RATING AND PERFORMANCE-BASED FEE AND AWARD TERM ELIGIBILITY

The FY 2009 Contractor performance grades for each Goal will be determined based on the weighted sum of the individual scores earned for each of the Objectives described within this document for Science and Technology and for Management and Operations. No overall rollup grade will be provided. The rollup of the performance of each Goal will then be utilized to determine the Contractor performance score for Science and Technology and Management and Operations (see Table A below). The total overall score derived for Science and Technology will be utilized to determine the amount of available fee that may be earned (see Table C). The overall score derived for Management and Operations will be utilize to determine the multiplier to be applied (see Table C) to the Science and Technology fee earned to determine the final amount of fee earned for FY 2009.. Each Goal is composed of two or more weighted Objectives and each Objective has a set of Performance Measures, which are identified to assist the reviewer in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the Performance Measures identifies significant activities, requirements, and/or milestones important to the success of the corresponding Objective and shall be utilized as the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting the Objective. Although the Performance Measures are the primary means for determining performance, other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources to include, but not limited to, the Contractor's self-evaluation report, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed), may be utilized in determining the Contractor's overall success in meeting an Objective. The following describes the methodology for determining the Contractor's grade for each Goal:

Performance Evaluation Methodology:
The purpose of this section is to establish a methodology to develop scoring at the Objective Level. Each Objective within a Goal shall be assigned a numerical score, per Figure I-1 below, by the evaluating office. Each evaluation will measure the degree of effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in meeting the Objective and shall be based on the Contractor's success in meeting the set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective as well as other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources as identified above. The set of Performance Measures identified for each Objective represent the set of significant indicators that if fully met, collectively places performance for the Objective in the "B+" grade range. For some targets, it serves the evaluator to provide additional grading details (for example at the A, C+, and D levels) and in those cases details have been included in the PEMP. However, these should be considered as guidelines that do not restrict the evaluation from considering other factors that contribute to the evaluation.

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
A+	4.3 – 4.1	Significantly exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance have or have the potential to significantly improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. No specific deficiency noted within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated.
A	4.0 – 3.8	Notably exceeds expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective or within other areas within the purview of the Objective. Areas of notable performance either have or have the potential to improve the overall mission of the Laboratory. Minor deficiencies noted are more than offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated and have no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
A-	3.7 – 3.5	Meets expectations of performance as set within performance measures identified for each Objective with some notable areas of increased performance identified. Deficiencies noted are offset by the positive performance within the purview of the overall Objective being evaluated with little or no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B+	3.4 – 3.1	Meets expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective with no notable areas of increased or diminished performance identified. Deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B	3.0 – 2.8	Most expectations of performance as set by the performance measures identified for each Objective are met and/or other minor deficiencies are identified. Performance measures or other minor deficiencies identified are offset by positive performance within the purview of the Objective and have little to no potential to adversely impact the mission of the Laboratory.
B-	2.7 – 2.5	One or two expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other deficiencies are identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C+	2.4 – 2.1	Some expectations of performance set by the performance measures are not met and/or other minor deficiencies are

Letter Grade	Numeric Grade	Definition
		identified and although they may be offset by other positive performance, they may have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C	2.0 – 1.8	A number of expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or a number of other deficiencies are identified and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
C-	1.7 – 1.1	Most expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other major deficiencies are identified which have or will negatively impact the Objective or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment if not immediately corrected.
D	1.0 – 0.8	Most or all expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the Objective and/or overall Laboratory mission accomplishment.
F	0.7 – 0	All expectations as set by the performance measures are not met and/or other significant deficiencies are identified which have significantly impacted both the Objective and the accomplishment of the Laboratory mission.

Figure I-1. Letter Grade and Numerical Score Definitions

Calculating Individual Goal Scores and Letter Grade:

Each Performance Objective is to be assigned an earned numerical score of 0 to 4.3 (see Figure 2) by the evaluating office as stated above. The Performance Goal rating is then computed by multiplying the numerical score by the weight of each Performance Objective and then adding them to develop an overall score for the Performance Goal. Raw scores from each calculation are to be carried through to the next stage of the calculation process. The raw score for each Performance Goal will then be rounded to the nearest tenth of a point for purposes of identifying the overall letter grade as indicated in Figure 2. A standard rounding convention of x.44 and less rounds down to the nearest tenth (here, x.4), while x.45 and greater rounds up to the nearest tenth (here, x.50) is to be utilized. An excel spreadsheet has been developed and issued to each Site Office to assist in the calculation of Goal scores/grades, as well as, fee determination. To ensure consistency throughout the SC evaluation process, this spreadsheet is to be utilized by each Site Office as the official calculations of all scores/grades and fee utilized within the Annual Contractor Performance Evaluation Report.

S&T Performance Goal	Numerical Score	Letter Grade	Weight	Weighted Score	Total Score
1.0 Mission Accomplishment			TBD%[1]		
2.0 Construction and Operations of User Research Facilities and Equipment			0%		
3.0 Science and Technology Research Project/Program Management			TBD%		
				Total Score	
M&O Performance Goal	**Numerical Score**	**Letter Grade**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Total Score**
4.0 Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory			20%		
5.0 Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection			30%		
6.0 Business Systems			20%		
7.0 Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio			20%		
8.0 Integrated Safeguards and Security Management and Emergency Management Systems			10%		
				Total Score	

Table A. FY 2009 Contractor Evaluation Score Calculation

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3 -4.1	4.0 - 3.8	3.7 - 3.5	3.4 - 3.1	3.0 - 2.8	2.7 - 2.5	2.4 - 2.1	2.0 - 1.8	1.7 - 1.1	1.0 – 0.8	0.7 – 0.0

Table B. FY 2009 Contractor Letter Grade Scale

[1] The final weights to be utilized for determining the overall S&T score will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

Determining the Amount of Performance-Based Fee Earned:
The percentage of the available performance-based fee that may be earned by the Contractor shall be determined based on the overall weighted score for the S&T Goals (see Table A. above) and then compared to Table C. below. The overall numerical score of the M&O Goals from Table A. above shall then be utilized to determine the final fee multiplier (see Table C.), which shall be utilized to determine the overall amount of performance-based fee earned for FY 2009 as calculated within Table D.

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
4.2		
4.1		
4.0	**97%**	**100%**
3.9		
3.8		
3.7	**94%**	**100%**
3.6		
3.5		
3.4	**91%**	**100%**
3.3		
3.2		
3.1		
3.0	**88%**	**95%**
2.9		
2.8		
2.7	**85%**	**90%**
2.6		
2.5		
2.4	**75%**	**85%**
2.3		
2.2		
2.1		
2.0	**50%**	**75%**
1.9		
1.8		
1.7	**0%**	**60%**
1.6		
1.5		
1.4		
1.3		

Overall Weighted Score from Table A.	Percent S&T Fee Earned	M&O Fee Multiplier
1.2		
1.1		
1.0 to 0.8	0%	0%
0.7 to 0.0	0%	0%

Table C. - Performance-Based Fee Earned Scale

Overall Fee Determination	
Percent S&T Fee Earned from Table C.	
M&O Fee Multiplier from Table C.	X
Overall Earned Performance-Based Fee	

Table D. – Final Percentage of Performance-Based Fee Earned Determination

Adjustment to the Letter Grade and/or Performance-Based Fee Determination:
The lack of performance objectives and measures in this plan do not diminish the need to comply with minimum contractual requirements. Although the performance-based Goals and their corresponding Objectives shall be the primary means utilized in determining the Contractor's performance grade and/or amount of performance-based fee earned, the Contracting Officer may unilaterally adjust the rating and/or reduce the otherwise earned fee based on the Contractor's performance against all contract requirements as set forth in the Prime Contract. While reductions may be based on performance against any contract requirement, specific note should be made to contract clauses which address reduction of fee including, Standards of Contractor Performance Evaluation, DEAR 970.5215-1 – Total Available Fee: Base Fee Amount and Performance Fee Amount, and Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts. Data to support rating and/or fee adjustments may be derived from other sources to include, but not limited to, operational awareness (daily oversight) activities; "For Cause" reviews (if any); other outside agency reviews (OIG, GAO, DCAA, etc.), and the annual 2-week review (if needed).

The adjustment of a grade and/or reduction of otherwise earned fee will be determined by the severity of the performance failure and consideration of mitigating factors. DEAR 970.5215-3 Conditional Payment of Fee, Profit, and Other Incentives – Facility Management Contracts is the mechanism used for reduction of fee as it relates to performance failures related to safeguarding of classified information and to adequate protection of environment, health and safety. Its guidance can also serve as an example for reduction of fee in other areas.
The final Contractor performance-based grades for each Goal and fee earned

determination will be contained within a year-end report, documenting the results from the DOE review. The report will identify areas where performance improvement is necessary and, if required, provide the basis for any performance-based rating and/or fee adjustments made from the otherwise earned rating/fee based on Performance Goal achievements.

Award Term Incentive.
Ames Laboratory Contract offers Award Term Incentives to the operating contractor. The base term of the contract is five years. The contract contains a non-monetary performance incentive which will allow the contractor to earn up to an additional fifteen years of contract term for exemplary performance. (Please refer to section F, Clause F.2 of Ames Contract for the details)

II. PERFORMANCE GOALS, OBJECTIVES & PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Background

The current performance-based management approach to oversight within DOE has established a new culture within the Department with emphasis on the customer-supplier partnership between DOE and the laboratory contractors. It has also placed a greater focus on mission performance, best business practices, cost management, and improved contractor accountability. Under the performance-based management system the DOE provides clear direction to the laboratories and develops annual performance plans (such as this one) to assess the contractors performance in meeting that direction in accordance with contract requirements. The DOE policy for implementing performance-based management includes the following guiding principles:

- Performance objectives are established in partnership with affected organizations and are directly aligned to the DOE strategic goals;
- Resource decisions and budget requests are tied to results; and
- Results are used for management information, establishing accountability, and driving long-term improvements.

The performance-based approach focuses the evaluation of the Contractor's performance against these Performance Goals. Progress against these Goals is measured through the use of a set of Objectives. The success of each Objective will be measured based on a set of Performance Measures, both objective and subjective, that are to focus primarily on end-results or impact and not on processes or activities. Measures provide specific evidence of performance, and collectively, they provide the body of evidence that indicates performance relative to the corresponding Objectives. On occasion however, it may be necessary to include a process/activity-oriented measure when there is a need for the Contractor to develop a system or process that does not currently exist but will be of significant importance to the DOE and the Laboratory when completed or that lead to the desired outcome/result.

The following sections describe the Performance Goals, their supporting Objectives, and associated Performance Measures for FY 2009.

1.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment

The Contractor produces high-quality, original, and creative results that advance science and technology; demonstrates sustained scientific progress and impact; receives appropriate external recognition of accomplishments; and contributes to overall research and development goals of the Department and its customers.

The weight of this Goal is TBD%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Mission Accomplishment Goal measures the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in delivering science and technology results which contribute to and enhance the DOE's mission of protecting our national and economic security by providing world-class scientific research capacity and advancing scientific knowledge by supporting world-class, peer-reviewed scientific results, which are recognized by others.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science, other cognizant HQ Program Offices, and other customers as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 1.1). The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)
- Office of Basic Energy Sciences (BES)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)
- Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 1.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 1.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 1.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

1.1 Science and Technology Results Provide Meaningful Impact on the Field

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The impact of publications on the field;
- Publication in journals outside the field indicating broad impact;
- Impact on DOE or other customer mission(s);
- Successful stewardship of mission-relevant research areas;
- Significant awards (R&D 100, FLC, Nobel Prizes, etc.);
- Invited talks, citations, making high-quality data available to the scientific community; and
- Development of tools and techniques that become standards or widely-used in the scientific community.

A to A+	Changes the way the research community thinks about a particular field; resolves critical questions and thus moves research areas forward; results generate huge interest/enthusiasm in the field.
B+	Impacts the community as expected. Strong peer review comments in all relevant areas.
B	Not strong peer review comments in at least one significant research area.
C	One research area just not working out. Peer review reveals that a program isn't going anywhere.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.2 Provide Quality Leadership in Science and Technology

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Willingness to pursue novel approaches and/or demonstration of innovative solutions to problems;
- Willingness to take on high-risk/high payoff/long-term research problems, evidence that the Contractor "guessed right" in that previous risky decisions proved to be correct and are paying off;
- The uniqueness and challenge of science pursued, recognition for doing the best work in the field;

- Extent of collaborative efforts, quality of the scientists attracted and maintained at the Laboratory;
- Staff members visible in leadership position in the scientific community; and
- Effectiveness in driving the direction and setting the priorities of the community in a research field.

A to A+	Laboratory staff led Academy or equivalent panels; laboratory's work changes the direction of research fields; world-class scientists are attracted to the laboratory, lab is trend-setter in a field.
B^{+}	Strong research performer in most areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; lab is center for high-quality research and attracts full cadre of researchers; some aspects of programs are world-class.
B	Strong research performer in many areas; staff asked to speak to Academy or equivalent panels to discuss further research directions; few aspects of programs are world-class.
C	Working on problems no longer at the forefront of science; stale research; evolutionary, not revolutionary.
D	Failure of multiple program elements.
F	Gross scientific incompetence and/or scientific fraud.

1.3 Provide and Sustain Outputs that Advance Program Objectives and Goals

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measures through defined project products, progress reports, statement of work, program management plans, Program Office and/or other reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quantity and quality of program/project (e.g., technical reports, policy papers, prototype demonstrations, tasks, etc.) output(s) be it policy, R&D, or implementation programs;
- The number of publications in peer-reviewed journals; and
- Demonstrated progress against peer reviewed recommendations, headquarters guidance, etc.

A to A+	Program offices, clients, end-users, independent experts and/or peers laud work results; output(s) exceeds the amount and/or quality typically expected for an excellent body of work.
B+	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are universally positive; output(s) meet the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; work demonstrates progress against review recommendations and/or headquarters guidance.
B	Program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews are largely positive, with only a few minor deficiencies and/or slightly negative

	responses noted; minor deficiencies and/or negative responses have little to no potential to adversely impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify a number of deficiencies and although they may be somewhat offset by other positive performance, they have the potential to negatively impact the overall program/project if not corrected.
D	Most outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All outputs have not met the amount and/or quality typically expected for the body of work; program office, client, end-user, independent expert and/or peer reviews identify significant deficiencies which have significantly impacted and/or damaged the overall program/project.

1.4 Provide for Effective Delivery of Products

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured through progress reports, peer reviews, Field Work Proposals (FWPs), Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and effectiveness in meeting goals and milestones documented within FWPs and/or other such documents;
- Efficiency and effectiveness in delivering on promises, and/or getting instruments to work as promised; and
- Efficiency and effectiveness in transmitting results to the community and/or responding to DOE or other customer guidance.

A to A+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are met well ahead of schedule and/or well under budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and results anticipate HQ guidance.
B+	Program/project goals and/or milestones are primarily met on schedule and within budget; program/project and/or mission objective(s) are fully meet and are fully responsive to HQ guidance.
B	Most program/project goals and/or milestones are met on schedule and within budget; overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) are meet; minor delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are minimized and/or have little to no adverse impact the overall program/project.
C	A number of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., less than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 15% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have the potential to adversely impact the overall program/project is

	not corrected.
D	Most of and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 6 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., less than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met or have the potential to be missed; sizeable delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.
F	All and/or key program/project goals and/or milestones are not met within the scheduled timeframe(s) (e.g., more than 9 months behind) and/or within the agreed upon budget (e.g., greater than 25% over); overall program/project and/or mission objective(s) have not been met; significant delays, overruns, and/or deficiencies are identified which have negatively impacted the overall program/project.

Science Program Office[2]	**Letter Grade**	**Numerical Score**	**Weight**	**Weighted Score**	**Overall Score**
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
1.1 Impact			40%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
1.1 Impact			50%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			15%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
1.1 Impact			25%		
1.2 Leadership			30%		
1.3 Output			30%		
1.4 Delivery			15%		
				Overall WDTS Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					

[2] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

1.1 Impact			30%		
1.2 Leadership			20%		
1.3 Output			20%		
1.4 Delivery			30%		
				Overall BER Total	

Table 1.1 – Program Office Performance Goal 1.0 Score Development

Science Program Office[3]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			TBD%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			TBD%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			TBD%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD%		
				Performance Goal 1.0 Total	

Table 1.2 – Overall Performance Goal 1.0 Score Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	**4.3 - 4.1**	**4.0 - 3.8**	**3.7 - 3.5**	**3.4 - 3.1**	**3.0 - 2.8**	**2.7 - 2.5**	**2.4 - 2.1**	**2.0 - 1.8**	**1.7 - 1.1**	**1.0 – 0.8**	**0.7 – 0.0**

Table 1.3 - Goal 1.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[3] The final weightings to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

GOAL 2.0 AND CORRESPONDING OBJECTIVES WILL NOT BE WEIGHTED OR ASSESSED DURING THE FY 2009 RATING PERIOD.

2.0 Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities

The Contractor provides effective and efficient strategic planning; fabrication, construction and/or operations of Laboratory research facilities; and are responsive to the user community.

The weight of this Goal is 0%.

The Provide for Efficient and Effective Design, Fabrication, Construction and Operations of Research Facilities Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for and delivering leading-edge specialty research and/or user facilities to ensure the required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges. It also measures the Contractor's innovative operational and programmatic means for implementation of systems that ensures the availability, reliability, and efficiency of these facilities; and the appropriate balance between R&D and user support.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 2.1). Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority (BA) for FY 2009.

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned to each of the objectives by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 2.1 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 2.2 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by BES.

Objectives:

2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s) as Required to Support Laboratory Programs (i.e., activities leading up to CD-2)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by scientific/technical workshops developing pre-conceptual R&D, progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Effectiveness of planning of pre-conceptual R&D and design for life-cycle efficiency;
- Leverage of existing facilities at the site;
- Delivery of accurate and timely information needed to carry out the critical decision and budget formulation process.; and
- Ability to meet the intent of DOE Order 413.3A, Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets.

A to A+	In addition to meeting all measures under B^+, the laboratory is recognized by the research community as the leader for making the science case for the acquisition; Takes the initiative to demonstrate the potential for revolutionary scientific advancement. Identifies, analyzes and champions novel approaches for acquiring the new capability, including leveraging or extending the capability of existing facilities and financing. Proposed approaches are widely regarded as innovative, novel, comprehensive, and potentially cost-effective. Reviews repeatedly confirm potential for scientific discovery in areas that support the Department's mission, and potential to change a discipline or research area's direction.
B+	Provides the overall vision for the acquisition. Displays leadership and commitment to achieving the vision within preliminary estimates that are defensible and credible in terms of cost, schedule and performance; develops quality analyses, preliminary designs, and related documentation to support the approval of the mission need (CD-0), the alternative selection and cost range (CD-1) and the performance baseline (CD-2). Solves problems and addresses issues. Keeps DOE appraised of the status, near-term plans and the resolution of problems on a regular basis. Anticipates emerging issues that could impact plans and takes the initiative to inform DOE of possible consequences.
B	Fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	The laboratory team develops the required analyses and documentation in a timely manner. However, inputs are mundane and lack innovation and commitment to the vision of the acquisition.
D	The potential exists for credible science and business cases to be made for the acquisition, but the laboratory fails to take advantage of the opportunity.
F	Proposed approaches are based on fraudulent assumptions; the science case is weak to non-existent, the business case is seriously flawed.

2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, Lehman reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Adherence to DOE Order 413.3A Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets;
- Successful fabrication of facility components
- Effectiveness in meeting construction schedule and budget; and
- Quality of key staff overseeing the project(s).

A toA+	Laboratory has identified and implemented practices that would allow the project scope to be increased if such were desirable, without impact on baseline cost or schedule; Laboratory always provides exemplary project status reports on time to DOE and takes the initiative to communicate emerging problems or issues. There is high confidence throughout the execution phase that the project will meet its cost/schedule performance baseline; Reviews identify environment, safety and health practices to be exemplary.
B+	The project meets CD-2 performance measures; the laboratory provides sustained leadership and commitment to environment, safety and health; reviews regularly recognize the laboratory for being proactive in the management of the execution phase of the project; to a large extent, problems are identified and corrected by the laboratory with little, or no impact on scope, cost or schedule; DOE is kept informed of project status on a regular basis; reviews regularly indicate project is expected to meet its cost/schedule performance baseline.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Reviews indicate project remains at risk of breaching its cost/schedule performance baseline; Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is adequate; Reports to DOE can vary in degree of completeness; Laboratory commitment to the project appears to be subsiding.
D	Reviews indicate project is likely to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline; and/or Laboratory commitment to environment, safety and health issues is inadequate; reports to DOE are largely incomplete; laboratory commitment to the project has subsided.
F	Laboratory falsifies data during project execution phase; shows disdain for executing the project within minimal standards for environment, safety or health, fails to keep DOE informed of project status; reviews regularly indicate that the project is expected to breach its cost/schedule performance baseline.

2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by progress reports, peer reviews, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, performance against benchmarks, Approved Financial Plans (AFPs), etc.:

- Availability, reliability, and efficiency of facility(ies);
- Degree the facility is optimally arranged to support community;
- Whether R&D is conducted to develop/expand the capabilities of the facility(ies);
- Effectiveness in balancing resources between facility R&D and user support; and
- Quality of the process used to allocate facility time to users.

A to A+	Performance of the facility exceeds expectations as defined before the start of the year in any of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations are less than planned and are acknowledged to be 'leadership caliber' by reviews; Data on ES&H continues to be exemplary and widely regarded as among the 'best in class'.
B^{+}	Performance of the facility meets expectations as defined before the start of the year in all of these categories: cost of operations, users served, availability, beam delivery, or luminosity, and this performance can be directly attributed to the efforts of the laboratory; and /or: the schedule and the costs associated with the ramp-up to steady state operations occur as planned; Data on ES&H continues to be very good as compared with other projects in the DOE.
B	The project fails to meet expectations in one of the areas listed under B+.
C	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in several of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low, the number of users is unexpectedly low beam delivery or luminosity is well below expectations. The facility operates at steady state, on cost and on schedule, but the reliability of performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the associated schedule and costs exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
D	Performance of the facility fails to meet expectations in many of the areas listed under B+; for example, the cost of operations is unexpectedly high and availability of the facility is unexpectedly low. The facility operates somewhat below steady state, on cost and on schedule, and the reliability performance is somewhat below planned values, **or** the facility operates at steady state, but the schedule and costs associated exceed planned values. Commitment to ES&H is satisfactory.
F	The facility fails to operate; the facility operates well below steady state **and/or** the reliability of the performance is well below planned values.

2.4 Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base and External User Community

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, participation in international design teams, Program/Staff Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The facility is being used to perform influential science;
- Contractor's efforts to take full advantage of the facility to strengthen the Laboratory's research base;
- Conversely the facility is strengthened by a resident research community that pushes the envelope of what the facility can do and/or are among the scientific leaders of the community;
- Contractor's ability to appropriately balance access by internal and external user communities; and

- There is a healthy program of outreach to the scientific community.

A to A+	Reviews document that multiple disciplines are using the facility in new and novel ways, that the facility is being used to pursue influential science, that full advantage has been taken of the facility to enhance external user access, and strengthen the laboratory's research base. A healthy outreach program is in place.
B+	Reviews state strong and effective approach exists toward establishing a large external and internal user community; that the facility is being used for influential science; the laboratory is capitalizing on existence of facility to grow internal scientific capabilities. A healthy outreach program is in place.
B	Reviews state that lab is establishing an external and internal user community, but laboratory is still not capitalizing fully on existence of the facility to grow internal capabilities and/or reach out to external users.
C	Reviews state that the laboratory has made satisfactory use of the facility, but has not demonstrated much innovation.
D	Few facility users, with none using it in novel ways; research base is very thin.
F	Laboratory does not know how to operate/use its own facility adequately.

Science Program Office[4]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
2.1 Provide Effective Facility Design(s)			0%		
2.2 Provide for the Effective and Efficient Construction of Facilities and/or Fabrication of Components			0%		
2.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Operation of Facilities			0%		
2.4 Effective Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support the Laboratory's Research Base			0%		
				Overall BES Total	

Table 2.1 – Program Office Performance Goal 2.0 Score Development

[4] A complete listing of S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I of this plan.

Science Program Office[5]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			0%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			0%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			0%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			0%		
				Performance Goal 2.0 Total	

Table 2.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3 - 4.1	4.0 - 3.8	3.7 - 3.5	3.4 - 3.1	3.0 - 2.8	2.7 - 2.5	2.4 - 2.1	2.0 - 1.8	1.7 - 1.1	1.0 – 0.8	0.7 – 0.0

Table 2.3 – Goal 2.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[5] The final weightings to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

3.0 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management

The Contractor provides effective program vision and leadership; strategic planning and development of initiatives; recruits and retains a quality scientific workforce; and provides outstanding research processes, which improve research productivity.

The weight of this Goal is TBD%.

The Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Program Management Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall management in executing S&T programs. Dimensions of program management covered include: 1) providing key competencies to support research programs to include key staffing requirements; 2) providing quality research plans that take into account technical risks, identify actions to mitigate risks; and 3) maintaining effective communications with customers to include providing quality responses to customer needs.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the Office of Science Program Office as identified below. The overall Goal score from each Program Office is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 3.1). The final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2009.

- Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research (ASCR)
- Office of Basic Engineering Sciences (BES)
- Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists (WDTS)
- Office of Biological and Scientific Research (BER)

The overall performance score and grade for this Goal will be determined by multiplying the overall score assigned by each of the offices identified above by the weightings identified for each and then summing them (see Table 3.2 below). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 3.3 to determine the overall letter grade for this Goal. Individual Program Office weightings for each of the Objectives identified below are provided within Table 3.1. The Contractor's success in meeting each Objective shall be determined based on the Contractor's performance as viewed by the Office of Science Program Offices for which the Laboratory conducts work. Should one or more of the HQ Program Offices choose not to provide an evaluation for this Goal and its corresponding Objectives, the weighting for the remaining HQ Program Offices shall be recalculated based on their percentage of BA for FY 2009 as compared to the total BA for those remaining HQ Program Offices.

Objectives:

3.1 Provide Effective and Efficient Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Program Vision

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of joint planning (e.g., workshops) with outside community;
- Articulation of scientific vision;
- Development of core competencies, ideas for new facilities and research programs; and
- Ability to attract and retain highly qualified staff.

A to A+	Providing strong programmatic vision that extends past the laboratory and for which the lab is a recognized leader within SC and in the broader research communities; development and maintenance of outstanding core competencies, including achieving superior scientific excellence in both exploratory, high-risk research and research that is vital to the DOE/SC missions; attraction and retention of world-leading scientists; recognition within the community as a world leader in the field.
B+	Coherent programmatic vision within the laboratory with input from and output to external research communities; development and maintenance of strong core competencies that are cognizant of the need for both high-risk research and stewardship for mission-critical research; attracting and retaining scientific staff who are very talented in all programs.
B	Programmatic vision that is only partially coherent and not entirely well connected with external communities; development and maintenance of some, but not all core competencies with attention to, but not always the correct balance between, high-risk and mission-critical research; attraction and retention of scientific staff who talented in most programs.
C	Failure to achieve a coherent programmatic vision with little or no connection with external communities; partial development and maintenance of core competencies (i.e., some are neglected) with imbalance between high-risk and mission-critical research; attracting only mediocre scientists while losing the most talented ones.
D	Minimal attempt to achieve programmatic vision; little ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; minimal success in attracting even reasonably talented scientists.
F	No attempt made to achieve programmatic vision; no demonstrated ability to develop any core competencies with a complete lack of high-risk research and ignorance of mission-critical areas; failure to attract even reasonably talented

	scientists.

3.2 Provide Effective and Efficient Science and Technology Project/Program Planning and Management

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by peer reviews, existence and quality of strategic plans as determined by SC and scientific community review, Program Office and scientific community review/oversight, etc.:

- Quality of R&D and/or user facility strategic plans
- Adequacy in considering technical risks;
- Success in identifying/avoiding technical problems;
- Effectiveness in leveraging (synergy with) other areas of research; and
- Demonstration of willingness to make tough decisions (i.e., cut programs with sub-critical mass of expertise, divert resources to more promising areas, etc.).

A to A+	Research plans are proactive, not reactive, as evidenced by making hard decisions and taking strong actions; plans are robust against budget fluctuations – multiple contingencies planned for; new initiatives are proposed and funded through reallocation of resources from less effective programs; plans are updated regularly to reflect changing scientific and fiscal conditions; plans include ways to reduce risk, duration of programs.
B^{+}	Plans are reviewed by experts outside of lab management and/or include broadly-based input from within the laboratory; research plans exist for all program areas; plans are consistent with known budgets and well-aligned with DOE interests; work follows the plan.
B	Research plans exist for all program areas; work follows the plan.
C	Research plans exist for most program areas; work does not always follow the plan.
D	Plans do not exist for a significant fraction of the lab's program areas, or significant work is conducted outside those plans.
F	No planning is done.

3.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Communications and Responsiveness to Customer Needs

In determining the performance of the Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following as measured by Program Office reviews/oversight, etc.:

- The quality, accuracy and timeliness of response to customer requests for information;

- The extent to which the Contractor keeps the customer informed of both positive and negative events at the Laboratory so that the customer can deal effectively with both internal and external constituencies; and
- The ease of determining the appropriate contact (who is on-point for what).

A to A+	Communication channels are well-defined and information is effectively conveyed; important or critical information is delivered in real-time; responses to HQ requests for information from laboratory representatives are prompt, thorough, correct and succinct; laboratory representatives *always* initiate a communication with HQ on emerging issues there are no surprises.
B^{+}	Good communication is valued by all staff throughout the contractor organization; responses to requests for information are thorough and are provided in a timely manner; the integrity of the information provided is never in doubt
B	Evidence of good communications is noted throughout the contractor organization and responses to requests for information provide the minimum requirements to meet HQ needs; with the exception of a few minor instances HQ is alerted to emerging issues.
C	Laboratory representatives recognize the value of sound communication with HQ to the mission of the laboratory. However, laboratory management fails to demonstrate that its employees are held accountable for ensuring effective communication and responsiveness; laboratory representatives do not take the initiative to alert HQ to emerging issues.
D	Communications from the laboratory are well-intentioned but generally incompetent; the laboratory management does not understand the importance of effective communication and responsiveness to the mission of the laboratory.
F	Contractor representatives are openly hostile and/or non-responsive – emails and phone calls are consistently ignored; communications typically do not address the request; information provided can be incorrect, inaccurate or fraudulent – information is not organized, is incomplete, or is fabricated.

Science Program Office[6]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Weight	Weighted Score	Overall Score
Office of Basic Energy Sciences					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			40%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall BES Total	
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			30%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			30%		
				Overall ASCR Total	
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			40%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			40%		
				Overall WDTS Total	
Office of Biological and Environmental Research					
3.1 Effective and Efficient Stewardship			20%		
3.2 Project/Program Planning and Management			30%		
3.3 Communications and Responsiveness			50%		
				Overall ASCR Total	

Table 3.1 – Program Office Performance Goal 3.0 Score Development

[6] A complete listing of the S&T Goals & Objectives weightings for the SC Programs is provided within Attachment I to this plan.

Science Program Office[7]	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Funding Weight (BA)	Weighted Score	Overall Weighted Score
Office of Advanced Scientific Computing Research			TBD%		
Office of Basic Energy Sciences			TBD%		
Office of Workforce Development for Teachers and Scientists			TBD%		
Office of Biological and Environmental Research			TBD%		
				Overall Program Office Total	

Table 3.2 – Overall Performance Goal Score Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	**4.3 - 4.1**	**4.0 - 3.8**	**3.7 - 3.5**	**3.4 - 3.1**	**3.0 - 2.8**	**2.7 - 2.5**	**2.4 - 2.1**	**2.0 - 1.8**	**1.7 - 1.1**	**1.0 – 0.8**	**0.7 – 0.0**

Table 3.3 - Goal 3.0 Goal Final Letter Grade

[7] Weightings for each Customer listed within Table 2.2 are preliminary, based upon FY 2007 Budget Authority figures, and are provided for informational purposes only. Final weights to be utilized for determining weighted scores will be determined following the end of the performance period and will be based on actual Budget Authority for FY 2007.

4.0 Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory

The Contractor's Leadership provides effective and efficient direction in strategic planning to meet the mission and vision of the overall Laboratory; is accountable and responsive to specific issues and needs when required; and corporate office leadership provides appropriate levels of resources and support for the overall success of the Laboratory.

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The "Provide Sound and Competent Leadership and Stewardship of the Laboratory" Goal shall measure the Contractor's Leadership capabilities in leading the direction of the overall Laboratory. It also measures the responsiveness of the Contractor to issues and opportunities for continuous improvement and corporate office involvement/commitment to the overall success of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 4.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 4.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out Those Plans

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Quality of the vision developed for the Laboratory and effectiveness in identifying its distinctive characteristics;
- Quality of Strategic/Work Plan for achieving the approved Laboratory vision;
- Quality of required Annual Laboratory Plan;

- Ability to establish and maintain long-term partnerships/relationships that advance/expand ongoing Laboratory missions and/or provide new opportunities/capabilities; and
- Effectiveness in developing and implementing commercial research and development opportunities that leverage accomplishment of DOE goals and projects with other federal agencies that advances the utilization of Laboratory technologies and capabilities

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

4.1.1 The Contractor and Laboratory Senior Leadership provide effective strategic guidance and support for Ames Laboratory's science programs and operations. They develop and promote scientific initiatives, strengthen core competencies, and seek opportunities to further support the DOE missions, consistent with the Laboratory's stated vision, and the Laboratory Business Plan.

4.1.2 The Contractor and the Laboratory develop new, and strengthen existing, mutually beneficial partnerships with key government, industry, university and other Laboratory partners.

4.1.3 The Laboratory Business Plan provides all required data in a clear and concise manner and is completed within established guidelines and schedules.

4.1.4 The Contractor and Laboratory seek opportunities for public outreach through science education in concert with DOE and community outreach activities.

4.1.5 To further efforts in understanding the "cost of doing of business" and to seek opportunities to be as cost efficient as possible, the Laboratory creates a cost report that compares FY2008 operating costs and FTEs to the "cost of doing business" baseline data developed for FY2007. Also identifies major changes in indirect costs between the models (changes > 10%), and if requested, provides a brief explanation for their cause.

4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership Throughout the Organization

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Leadership's ability to instill responsibility and accountability down and through the entire organization; and
- The effectiveness and efficiency of Leadership in identifying and/or responding to Laboratory issues or opportunities for continuous improvement.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

4.2.1 The Contractor Senior Leadership is accountable and responsive to resolving strategic issues that impact the overall performance of the Laboratory (if any).

4.2.2 The Contractor and Laboratory's Senior Leadership's response to Laboratory program and operational issues is timely and of high quality. Mitigating actions are identified and implemented as appropriate.

4.2.3 Laboratory Management proactively implements opportunities for improvement in accordance with agreed upon plans, and maintains cognizance of corrective action plans, ensuring timely and effective implementation in accordance with those agreed upon plans.

4.2.4 The Laboratory continues to effectively implement its Contractor Assurance System. The Laboratory expands its elements of appraisals/assessments and lessons learned to the operational areas of safeguards and security, cyber-security, and emergency management.

4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Corporate Office Support as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Corporate Office involvement in and support of business and other infrastructure process and procedure improvements;
- The willingness to enter into and effectiveness of joint appointments when appropriate; and
- Where appropriate, the willingness to develop and work with the Department in implementing innovative financing agreements and/or provide private investments into the Laboratory.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

4.3.1 The Contractor participates in peer reviews of Laboratory science programs and provides for review of Laboratory business management and ES&H systems to feed the development of strategic guidance, refine performance measures and assist with enhancing and improving the Laboratory's core competencies.

4.3.2 The Contractor works with the Laboratory to identify openings that could be filled with joint-appointees that would help strengthen the Laboratory and enhance core competencies, while supporting the mission of both institutions.

4.3.3 The Contractor considers and proposes innovative options, such as third party financing, to enhance and/or maintain the Laboratory.

4.3.4 The Contractor effectively provides corporate expertise and "reach back" (using ISU specialized skills and resources) as needed to advance the Laboratory Business Plan.

4.3.5 The Contractor will ensure that commitments made during the proposal process and contractor commitments made to DOE during the current performance period are successfully accomplished as planned.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
4.0 Effectiveness and Efficiency of Contractor Leadership and Stewardship					
4.1 Provide a Distinctive Vision for the Laboratory and an Effective Plan for Accomplishment of the Vision to Include Strong Partnerships Required to Carry Out those Plans			35%		
4.2 Provide for Responsive and Accountable Leadership throughout the Organization			30%		
4.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Contractor Support			35%		
Performance Goal 4.0 Total					

Table 4.1 – Goal 4.0 Performance Rating Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	**4.3 - 4.1**	**4.0 - 3.8**	**3.7 - 3.5**	**3.4 - 3.1**	**3.0 - 2.8**	**2.7 - 2.5**	**2.4 - 2.1**	**2.0 - 1.8**	**1.7 - 1.1**	**1.0 – 0.8**	**0.7 – 0.0**

Table 4.2 - Goal 4.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safety, health and environmental protection through a strong and well deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 30%.

The "Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection Goal" shall measure the Contractor's overall success in preventing worker injury and illness; implement ISM down through and across the organization; and provide effective and efficient waste management, minimization, and pollution prevention.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 5.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 5.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The success in meeting ES&H goals.
- Laboratory Management participation and level of involvement in goals.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

5.1.1 The Contractor's success in reducing serious illnesses and injuries as measured by the days away, restricted or transferred (DART) case rate.

Days Away, Restricted, or Transferred (DART) Case Rate – the number of cases of an injury or illness case where the most serious outcome of the case, as identified on the OSHA Form 300 columns H or I, resulted in days away from work or days of job restriction or transfer x 200,000 (100 employees working 40 hours per week for 50 weeks per year) / the actual number of hours worked. The SC DART Goal for 2009 = 0.25.

5.1.1.1 Target

DART Case Rate
0.25

5.1.2 The Contractor's success in reducing accidents, illnesses and injuries as measured by the total reportable case rate (TRCR).

Total Recordable Case Rate - The number of all occupational illnesses and occupational injuries resulting in loss of consciousness, restriction of work or motion, transfer to another job, or require medical treatment beyond first aid x 200,000 (100 employees working 40 hours per week for 50 weeks per year) / the actual number of hours worked. The SC TRCR target for 2009= 0.65.

5.1.2.1 Target

TRCR
0 .65

5.1.3 The number of reportable occurrences related to environmental compliance.

5.1.3.1 Target

Zero environmental compliance occurrences that meet the threshold for ORPS reporting at a significance category level 1, 2, or 3

5.1.4 Completion of corrective actions related to ES&H reviews and reportable events, as designated and agreed to by the Laboratory and Ames Site Office within the scheduled due date. All changes in scheduled due dates must be agreed to by Ames Site Office.

5.1.4.1 Target

All corrective actions completed as mutually agreed

5.1.5 The strength of the Laboratory's Independent Walk-through Program, as measured by performance of walk-through of laboratory spaces by a team of safety specialists, with participation by Senior Management.

5.1.5.1 Target

To meet target expectations, Senior Laboratory Management (Laboratory Director, Deputy Director, Division Directors, and or Associate Director(s)) participates in 100% of Walkthroughs. Senior Laboratory Management participation and level of involvement with the identification and correction of deficiencies will be considered for meeting higher levels of performance.

5.1.5.2 Target

To meet target expectations, inspections of 100% of the Laboratory space is completed during FY 2009.

5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The commitment of leadership to strong ES&H performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of hazard identification, prevention, and control processes/activities; and
- The degree to which scientists and workers are involved and engaged in the ES&H program at the bench level.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

5.2.1 Commitment to hazard awareness is demonstrated by employee completion of required ESH training.

5.2.1.1 Target

To meet the target expectation, 90% of mandatory ES&H re-training is completed on time.

5.2.2 Completion rate of concerns identified during the Annual Independent Walk-through are corrected within scheduled time period.

5.2.2.1 Target

To meet the target expectation, 90% of the concerns identified during the Annual Independent Walk-through are corrected within the scheduled time period.

5.2.3 The strength of the Laboratory's program to improve safety systems as measured by the quality and number of Topical Appraisals of ES&H.

5.2.3.1 Target

To meet the target expectation, quality internal topical appraisals are completed annually to address issues identified and agreed to by the Laboratory and Ames Site Office.

5.2.4 Repeat findings are minimized by effective causal analysis and corrective action development and implementation.

5.2.4.1 Target

To meet the target expectation, repeat findings do not account for more than 7% of all internal and external appraisal findings.

5.2.5 The strength of the Laboratory's processes to plan work safely as measured by completion and/or updating of the 45 Readiness Reviews scheduled for 2009.

5.2.5.1 Target

To meet target expectation, 100% of 5-year Readiness Reviews are completed or resolved by the scheduled review date and in all cases prior to work resumption of inactive activities.

5.2.5.2 Target

To meet the target expectation, work processes identified via the Annual Independent Walk-through and observations are cross-referenced with existing Research activities approved by the Laboratory's Safety Review Committee through the Readiness Review and activity reviews, and documentation is updated accordingly.

5.2.6 The Laboratory implements effective systems of reporting ESH concerns and conducting causal analyses.

5.2.6.1 Target

To meet target, all ORPS and Price Anderson Amendment Act (PAAA) concerns and events are reported consistent with requirements and within the specified time periods.

5.2.7 The Laboratory will conduct quarterly forums with safety specialists from Iowa State University's Environment Health and Safety Department and Laboratory staff representatives (such as principal investigators, graduate students, merit employees, and hourly workers) to discuss safety program improvements and share lessons learned from DOE and the Contractor and other academic institutions.

5.2.7.1 Target

To meet target, the Laboratory will conduct quarterly forums as described above. The implementation of program improvements and the sharing of lessons learned from the forums will be considered for attaining higher levels of performance.

5.3 Provide Efficient & Effective Waste Management, Minimization, & Pollution Prevention

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Efficiency and Effectiveness of efforts to minimize the generation of waste.

The weight of this Objective is 30%.

5.3.1 Success in ongoing efforts to reduce hazardous waste.

5.3.1.1 Target
To meet the target, all new activities will be specifically reviewed for waste minimization efforts. These reviews will be documented in the individual Readiness Reviews.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
5.0 Sustain Excellence and Enhance Effectiveness of Integrated Safety, Health, and Environmental Protection					
5.1 Provide a Work Environment that Protects Workers and the Environment			35%		
5.2 Provide Efficient and Effective Implementation of Integrated Safety, Health and Environment Management			35%		
5.3 Provide Efficient and Effective Waste Management, Minimization, and Pollution Prevention			30%		
Performance Goal 5.0 Total					

Table 5.1 – Goal 5.0 Performance Rating Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3 -4.1	4.0 - 3.8	3.7 - 3.5	3.4 - 3.1	3.0 - 2.8	2.7 - 2.5	2.4 - 2.1	2.0 - 1.8	1.7 - 1.1	1.0 – 0.8	0.7 – 0.0

Table 5.2 - Goal 5.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) Goal.

The Contractor sustains and enhances core business systems that provide efficient and effective support to Laboratory programs and its mission(s).

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s) Goal shall provide business systems that efficiently and effectively support the overall mission of the Laboratory Goal; shall measure the Contractor's overall success in deploying, implementing, and improving integrated business system that efficiently and effectively support the mission(s) of the Laboratory.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 6.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 6.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective financial management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the financial management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;

- The continual improvement of financial management system(s) through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 25%.

6.1.1 STARS reporting requirements are met. Integrated Contractor Summary of Collections are submitted to EFASC by 12:00 noon local time on the first workday of each month. Monthly accounting data is submitted to STARS by 12:00 noon local time on the second workday of each month.

6.1.1.1 Target

To meet the target:

a) The Laboratory will meet the reporting deadline for submission of Integrated Contractor Summary of Collections in 11 out of the 12 months, with no submissions beyond the second workday of the month.

b) The Laboratory will meet the reporting deadline for monthly accounting data in 11 out of the 12 months, with no submissions beyond the third workday of each month.

6.1.2 Budget formulation documents are submitted in a high quality and timely manner.

6.1.2.1 Target

To meet the target, the Laboratory submits their FY2011 budget in accordance with format, content, and schedule prescribed by DOE. The DOE annual budget validation reports no significant findings.

6.1.3 The effectiveness of the budget and cost processes and systems is validated by no significant cost overruns or material suspense items being reported in STARS.

6.1.3.1 Target

To meet the target, costs do not exceed the amount of funding (obligations) provided in the contract. In addition, the Integrated Cost Overrun account is reviewed and managed such that this account is only used for undistributed overhead costs and portions of transitory unbilled receivables (which are billed in the subsequent month), and is reduced to ZERO at year-end.

6.1.4 DOE Direct Funding and Direct Costs and Commitments at Year-End. The effectiveness of the budget and cost processes and systems is validated by no significant cost overruns or material suspense items being reported in STARS.

6.1.4.1 Target

To meet the target:

a) Costs are within B&R detailed reporting level at the end of each monthly accounting period.

b) The sum of the DOE direct-funded costs and commitments do not exceed available funds at the B&R detailed reporting level at year-end.

6.1.5 The effectiveness of the financial management system is validated by internal and external audits/reviews/inspections, contractor self-assessments and routine communication with AMSO and CH.

6.1.5.1 Target

To meet the target:

a) There are no material finding or agreed upon recommendations. A material finding is generally defined as a violation of the contract, applicable laws and regulations, or a violation of internal controls sufficiently large as to cause a serious case of mismanagement, the charging of unallowable cost, or a situation that misstates the facts.

b) Additionally, corrective actions for all audit findings and recommendations are implemented within agreed upon schedules.

c) There are no repeat audit findings and recommendations.

6.1.6 Contractor billings should conform to signed Work For Others agreements in that total billing should not exceed agreement amounts, funding expiration dates should be observed, and closeouts should be initiated promptly upon completion of work.

6.1.6.1 Target

To meet the target:
1. Zero billing errors on non-corporate/interoffice invoices.

2. 100% of the Laboratory WFO agreements must initiate closeout procedures within 45 days after work is completed, unless being negotiated for extension.

3. Un-liquidated advances will be returned to the sponsor no later than 60 days after receipt the of the final contract modification that has de-obligated these funds.

6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator shall consider the following:
- Demonstration of efficient and effective acquisition management system support;
- The effectiveness of the acquisition system as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of acquisition management system through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

6.2.1 Demonstrate effective acquisition management systems through mechanisms such as external/internal reviews, surveys, inspections and ongoing communication with the AMSO and the Chicago Office.

6.2.1.1 Target

To meet the target, there are no significant findings. Any minor findings are corrected in an effective and timely manner.

6.2.2 Perform Procurement Balanced Scorecard evaluation in accordance with the FY 2009 Balanced Scorecard Plan.

6.2.2.1 Target

To meet the target, the Laboratory successfully meets at least 90% of the BSC targets.

6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective property management system(s) support;
- The effectiveness of the property management system(s) as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of property management system(s) through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

6.3.1 Demonstrate effective Property Management Systems through mechanisms such as external/internal reviews, surveys, inspections and ongoing communication with the AMSO and the Chicago Office.

6.3.1.1 Target
To meet the target, there are no significant findings. Any minor findings are corrected in an effective and timely manner.

6.3.2 Perform Property Balanced Scorecard evaluation in accordance with the FY 2009 Balanced Scorecard Plan.

6.3.2.1 Target

To meet the target, the Laboratory successfully meets at least 90% of the BSC targets.

6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System and Diversity Program

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective human resources management system support;
- The effectiveness of the human resources management system as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of the human resources management system through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

6.4.1 Existing professional and scientific (P&S) performance review process will be evaluated through the use of a customer focused review team consisting of select managers and employees of the lab, and performance reviews of P&S and merit staff will be completed in FY2009.

6.4.1.1 Target

To meet the target, current performance review process will be evaluated and recommendations will be provided to Ames Lab executive council with the goal implementing future improvements in FY 2010.

6.4.1.2 Target

To meet the target, 75% of permanent professional and scientific and merit employees will have a documented performance review completed in FY 2009.

6.4.2 Demonstrate that permanent positions are properly classified and are reviewed on a continuous basis.

6.4.2.1 Target

To meet the target, 25% of position descriptions for permanent exempt and non-exempt positions will be reviewed for appropriateness of knowledge, skills, and abilities to determine/confirm that positions are appropriately classified.

6.4.3 Maintains a systematic approach to the recruiting and retention of new talent from diverse populations.

6.4.3.1 Target

To meet the target, the level of diversity obtained within recruitment pools for advertised positions will be reviewed by race and gender and will show an increase of at least 25% over the last performance period.

6.4.3.2 Target

To meet the target, at least 85% of hiring managers/supervisors will complete the University's "Invite Diversity" online training module prior to initiating the hiring process at least once every two years.

6.4.4 A mentoring program will be developed and implemented for 30% of critical positions within the lab with an emphasis on the professional development and mentoring of women and minorities.

6.4.4.1 Target

To meet the target, the participation rate in the mentoring program will be tracked for the identified critical positions and will have an 85% (of the 30% above) participation rate, including women and minorities.

6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Demonstration of efficient and effective management systems support;
- The effectiveness of the management systems as validated by internal and external audits and reviews;
- The continual improvement of management systems through the use of results of audits, review, and other information; and
- The degree of knowledge and appropriate utilization of established system processes/procedures by Contractor management and staff.

The weight of this Objective is 25%.

6.5.1 Maintain quality management of the Internal Audit Function through the adequacy of planning and execution of internal audits and timeliness of audit follow-up and resolution.

6.5.1.1 Target

To meet the target, the Internal Audit function will need to meet the following expectations and will be evaluated by considering the following:

a) Development of an internal audit plan that is submitted timely and found acceptable to DOE

b) Internal audit responsiveness to DOE Site Office and Integrated Service Center issues.

c) Effectiveness and independence of the internal audit function

d) 90% of internal audits completed in accordance with the DOE approved plan. (The approved plan can be modified during the year as audits are deleted or added by DOE.)

e) Internal audit follows up within 60 days of action closure to ensure that the proper resolution of findings was taken by management

To meet the target, all areas requiring corrective action must be completed by the specified due date(s) and offer resolutions that are responsive to any cited incidence.

6.5.2 The Laboratory provides effective tactical Information Technology (IT) planning in support of the Laboratory's mission and goals.

6.5.2.1 Target

To meet the target, FY 2010 IM plans are in alignment with the DOE Lab Plan for Ames; 2010 IM plan in place by September 30, 2009.

6.5.3 The IM Program provides cost effective products and improved services.

6.5.3.1 Target

To meet the target, IM accomplishments completed based on FY 2009 IM plans and demonstrate measurable improvement and cost effective IM services and products.

6.5.4 IM products and services meet customer requirements as demonstrated by customer feedback.

6.5.4.1 Target

To meet the target, customer surveys indicate 85% of customers feel that the IM service provided is acceptable.

6.5.5 Laboratory Public Affairs develops and executes integrated communications plans.

6.5.5.1 Target
Laboratory (management and Public Affairs) develop a communications plan to support the Laboratory goals of increasing its profile with community and science stakeholders in an effort to help build the Laboratory. The plan will be prepared by Ames Laboratory and reviewed by Ames Laboratory Management, and approved by CH Communication Office by January 30, 2009. It will include elements on improving the Lab's branding, communicating with the Lab's many stakeholders, and include a review of the Public Affairs emergency management plan.

6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of Intellectual Assets

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The proper stewardship of intellectual assets and Laboratory owned or originated technology;
- The market impacts created/generated as a result of technology transfer and deployment activities; and
- Communication products contributing to the transfer of Laboratory originated knowledge and technology.

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

6.6.1 The Technical Transfer Program meets customer's expectations

6.6.1.1 Target

To meet the target, Technical Transfer performs customer surveys and based on data from those surveys the Contractor develops corrective actions and/or improvement plans, acceptable to the site office, for any identified issues and all actions are completed per the agreed upon corrective actions.

6.6.2 Work For Others (WFO) projects received by the site office are consistent with DOE policies and strategic goals.

6.6.2.2 Target

To meet the target, internal systems and documentation provide adequate information to ensure that all Technical Transfer activities is consistent with DOE goals, policies, and procedures. (System Validation)

6.6.3 The Contractor will timely report new inventions to DOE, filing U.S. and where appropriate, foreign applications to create intellectual property assets. The Contractor provides DOE with all intellectual property reports and documents under the Prime Contract.

6.6.3.1 Target

To meet the target, the Contractor shall disclose each subject invention to DOE Patent Counsel within two months after the inventor discloses it in writing to contractor personnel responsible for patent matters. All invention disclosures should be submitted through the I-Edison system and be accurate and complete.

The Contractor shall promptly respond to DOE requests for Intellectual Property information, and shall provide accurate and complete reports in a timely manner consistent with its deliverables obligations under the Prime Contract.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
6.0 Deliver Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Business Systems and Resources that Enable the Successful Achievement of the Laboratory Mission(s)					
6.1 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Financial Management System(s)			25%		
6.2 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Acquisition System			10%		
6.3 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Property Management System			10%		
6.4 Provide an Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Human Resources Management System			10%		
6.5 Provide Efficient, Effective, and Responsive Management Systems for Internal Audit and Oversight; Quality; Information Management; and Other Administrative Support Services as Appropriate			25%		
6.6 Demonstrate Effective Transfer of Technology and Commercialization of			20%		

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
Intellectual Assets					
Performance Goal 6.0 Total					

Table 6.1 – 6.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3 - 4.1	4.0 - 3.8	3.7 - 3.5	3.4 - 3.1	3.0 - 2.8	2.7 - 2.5	2.4 - 2.1	2.0 - 1.8	1.7 - 1.1	1.0 – 0.8	0.7 – 0.0

Table 6.2 - Goal 6.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs

The Contractor provides appropriate planning for, construction and management of Laboratory facilities and infrastructures required to efficiently and effectively carry out current and future S&T programs.

The weight of this Goal is 20%.

The Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs Goal shall measure the overall effectiveness and performance of the Contractor in planning for, delivering, and operations of Laboratory facilities and equipment needed to ensure required capabilities are present to meet today's and tomorrow's complex challenges.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 7.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 7.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The management of real property assets to maintain effective operational safety, worker health, environmental protection and compliance, property preservation, and cost effectiveness while meeting program missions, through effective facility utilization, maintenance and budget execution;
- The day-to-day management and utilization of space in the active portfolio;
- The maintenance and renewal of building systems, structures and components associated with the Laboratory's facility and land assets; and
- The management of energy use and conservation practices.

The weight of this Objective is 80%.

7.1.1 Evidence is provided that validates the readiness of existing facilities and infrastructure to carryout the assigned scientific missions. Critical maintenance funding is allocated and effectively spent. The Mission Readiness Model, as modified for site needs, will be implemented in FY2009.

7.1.1.1 Target

By September 30, 2009, Ames will perform an assessment (and document it) to identify infrastructure gaps in supporting their mission and Laboratory Plan and they will develop the associated proposed funding and schedule plan to close the gaps over a ten year period.

7.1.2 Effective execution of the goals within the Energy Performance Management Agreement.

7.1.2.1 Target

The Laboratory will complete 80% of the energy requirements scheduled to be accomplished during the Fiscal Year in accordance with the Comprehensive Energy Management Plan (CEMP).

7.1.2.2 Target

The Laboratory demonstrates commitment to purchase of at least 8 energy efficient products, including products with low standby power devices.

[Note: A list of device types and specific products within the type having recommended low standby levels can be found at http://oahu.lbl.gov/.]

7.1.2.3 Target

The Laboratory demonstrates commitment to the purchase of at least 8 Water Sense Products. [Note: A list of device types and specific products can be found at http://www.watersenseproducts.com/]

7.1.3 The Laboratory will support goals of the Department of Energy's Transformational Energy Action Management (TEAM) initiative, and the goals and objectives contained in Executive Order 13423, Strengthening Federal Environmental, Energy, and Transportation Management, and provide full and open access to the maximum extent practicable to Energy Service Companies (ESCOs) under the Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC). Also ensure ESCO personnel are granted access pursuant to contractual requirements; monitor ESCO activities to ensure that site safety and security requirements are adhered to; promptly provide information requested by ESCO personnel to assist them in developing viable recommendations; and, when directed by the Contracting Officer, assist the Site Office in the monitoring and execution of ESPC projects.

7.1.3.1 Target

If the ESCO contract is awarded, the Laboratory will support the implementation of FY 2009 energy reduction projects. The Contractor will provide high quality technical advice to the Site Office as needed.

7.1.3.2 Target

The Contractor shall provide effective subcontractor safety oversight that results in no reportable subcontractor safety incident found to have a cause that can be attributed to Ames Laboratory.

7.1.4 Establish a Site Metering Plan that identifies meters to be installed in accordance with the guidelines of the DOE Metering Plan.

7.1.4.1 Target

The Site Metering Plan is updated by Aug 31, 2009 and in FY Ames will install one advanced meter as planned by 9/30/09.

7.1.5 Three point seven five percent (3.75%) of electricity purchased by the laboratory must be from renewable energy sources. (This can include Renewable Energy Certificates).

7.1.5.1 Target

In FY 2009, 3.75% of electricity must be purchased from a renewable source.

7.1.6 By FY2015, reduce potable water use by no less than 16 percent, relative to the Department's potable water use in FY 2007.

7.1.6.1 Target

Reduce potable water usage by 2% less then the previous year.

7.1.7 Develop a plan to assess the current building inventory to determine the extent to which the High Performance and Sustainable Buildings (HPSB) Guiding Principles are applied.

7.1.7.1 Target

Provide an acceptable plan by December 31, 2008.

7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- Integration and alignment of the Laboratory Plan to the Laboratory's comprehensive strategic plan;
- The facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition for effective translation of business needs into comprehensive and integrated facility site plans;
- The effectiveness in producing quality site and facility planning documents as required;
- The involvement of relevant stakeholders in all appropriate aspects of facility planning and preparation of required documentation;
- Overall responsiveness to customer mission needs; and
- Efficiency in meeting Cost and Schedule Performance Indices for construction projects (when appropriate).

The weight of this Objective is 20%.

7.2.1 Establish and maintain a program that provides for planning and acquiring the facilities and infrastructure required to support future laboratory programs.

Target 7.2.1.1

Implement facility planning, forecasting, and acquisition activities that accurately translate needs and facility condition information into useful strategic plans; and the Laboratory Plan and the Integrated Facilities Infrastructure (IFI) Budget are submitted according to the required schedule, and demonstrate effective and realistic facility planning

Target 7.2.1.2

A high quality Critical Decision 0 Package is completed for the Metals Development Building by 9/30/09.
.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
7.0 Sustain Excellence in Operating, Maintaining, and Renewing the Facility and Infrastructure Portfolio to Meet Laboratory Needs					
7.1 Manage Facilities and Infrastructure in an Efficient and Effective Manner that Optimizes Usage, Minimizes Life Cycle Costs, and Ensures Site Capability to Meet Mission Needs			80%		
7.2 Provide Planning for and Acquire the Facilities and Infrastructure Required to Support the Continuation and Growth of Laboratory Missions and Programs			20%		
				Performance Goal 7.0 Total	

Table 7.1 – 7.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3 - 4.1	4.0 - 3.8	3.7 - 3.5	3.4 - 3.1	3.0 - 2.8	2.7 - 2.5	2.4 - 2.1	2.0 - 1.8	1.7 - 1.1	1.0 – 0.8	0.7 – 0.0

Table 7.2 - Goal 7.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems

The Contractor sustains and enhances the effectiveness of integrated safeguards and security and emergency management through a strong and well deployed system.

The weight of this Goal is 10%.

The Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM) and Emergency Management Systems Goal shall measure the Contractor's overall success in safeguarding and securing Laboratory assets that supports the mission(s) of the Laboratory in an efficient and effective manner and provides an effective emergency management program.

Each Objective within this Goal is to be assigned the appropriate numerical score by the evaluating office as described within Section I of this document. Each Objective has one or more measures, the outcomes of which collectively assist the evaluating office in determining the Contractor's overall performance in meeting that Objective. Each of the measures identifies significant tasks, activities, requirements, accomplishments, and/or milestones for which the outcomes/results of are important to the success of the corresponding Objective. Although other performance information available to the evaluating office from other sources may be used, the outcomes of measures identified for each Objective shall be the primary means of determining the

Contractor's success in meeting an Objective. The overall Goal score is computed by multiplying numerical scores earned by the weight of each Objective, and summing them (see Table 8.1 at the end of this section). The overall score earned is then compared to Table 8.2 to determine the overall Goal letter grade.

8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System

In measuring the performance of this Objective the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Emergency Management goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Emergency Management performance is appropriately demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Emergency Management procedures and processes are effectively demonstrated.

The weight of this Objective is 35%.

8.1.1 Maintenance of an effective emergency management program

To Meet the Target:

8.1.1.1 100% of Emergency Management events are effectively mitigated and notification reporting is done in accordance with DOE Order 151.1C.

8.1.1.2 Results of reviews, surveys, and inspections demonstrate that Emergency Management systems are effective.

8.1.1.3 100% Emergency Management Staff are trained in their Emergency Management responsibilities.

8.1.1.4 90% of the corrective actions associated with Emergency Management reviews are completed in accordance with scheduled due dates.

8.1.1.5 All required notifications of Operational Emergencies to offsite authorities are accomplished within the time required by DOE Order 151.1C.

8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Cyber-Security goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to a strong Cyber-Security performance is appropriately demonstrated;

- Integration of Cyber-Security into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Cyber-Security risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

The weight of this Objective is 50%.

8.2.1 Cyber Security Risks are understood by management, Security Plans are updated in a timely manner to reflect the current risk environment, the status of the Cyber Security Program is reported in accordance with FISMA and NIST Guidance, weaknesses and Cyber-Security incidents are reported and mitigated as necessary.

8.2.1.1 Target

To meet the target, the Designated Accrediting Authority (DAA) is briefed on cyber risk annually or sooner if needed. Plan of Action and Milestones (POAMs) are reported quarterly and are accompanied by a security status update for each cyber enclave. Certification and re-accreditations for each cyber enclave is accomplished in required timeframes. Incident reporting includes all classes of incidents from DOE Manual 205.1-1 the Office of Science PSCP, and the cyber related incidents listed in DOE Manual 470.4-1 Section N. In the event that there are no incidents, a negative report is submitted.

8.2.2 Continuous Monitoring is performed by the site in accordance with the contractor's assurance system (CAS) and reported to the DAA and the SC Cyber Security Manager.

8.2.2.1 Target

To meet the target, the self assessment program reviews the Ames Laboratory policy and procedures as represented by the approved Certification & Accreditation (C&A) package including coverage of NIST SP 800-53 security controls. The self assessment program includes a robust program of vulnerability scanning, the specifics of which have been approved by the DAA. Identified vulnerabilities are promptly analyzed and corrected as appropriate. High risk vulnerabilities are addressed within 10 calendar days. Moderate vulnerabilities on identified critical and/or sensitive systems are addressed within 10 business days. Ames Laboratory policies and site implementing procedures are current with requirements and are implemented or in process as indicated by the implementation schedule.

8.2.3 Employee Management awareness of their Cyber-Security responsibilities.

8.2.3.1 Target

To meet the target, 90% of Cyber Security staff and system administrators have received role based training annually and 95% of employees have received annual cyber security awareness training.

8.2.4 Establish and maintain a program of system and network configuration management for each defined system enclave.

8.2.4.1 Target

To meet the target, General Configuration guidelines are adopted and implemented. Specific configuration guidelines address prevalent system environments. Configuration guidelines are reviewed quarterly and updated as needed to address security advisories.

8.2.5 Effectively manage cyber security enhancement projects to address changes in program requirements.

8.2.5.1 Target

To meet the target, technical solutions to meet new requirements are proposed and put in services in accordance with implementation plans. Internal and/or external reviews for cyber security requirements and enhancements are completed with favorable results.

8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting Safeguard goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to strong Safeguards performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of Safeguards into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of Safeguards risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

The weight of this Objective is 10%.

8.3.1 Maintenance of an effective and efficient Safeguards and Security Program in accordance with DOE O 470.4 and DOE M 470.4-1.

To Meet the Target:

8.3.1.1 Incidents of Safeguards and Security concerns are detected, reported, investigated and resolved promptly.

8.3.1.2 Demonstrate an effective Integrated Safeguards and Security Management System through a thorough annual self-assessment and by positive results from any external reviews surveys and inspections

8.3.1.3 Corrective actions or compensatory measures for deficiencies are promptly implemented and monitored until resolution

8.3.1.4 90% of employees have participated in training that demonstrated an awareness of their Safeguards responsibilities

8.3.1.5 Vulnerability Assessments accurately address current Laboratory operations.

8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information

In measuring the performance of this Objective, the DOE evaluator(s) shall consider the following:

- The Contractor's success in meeting protection of classified and sensitive information goals and expectations;
- The commitment of leadership to strong protection of classified and sensitive information performance is appropriately demonstrated;
- Integration of protection of classified and sensitive information into the culture of the organization for effective deployment of the system is demonstrated; and
- The maintenance and appropriate utilization of protection of classified and sensitive information risk identification, prevention, and control processes/activities.

The weight of this Objective is 5%.

8.4.1 Counter Intelligence (CI) and the sensitive unclassified information programs are maintained in an effective and efficient manner.

To Meet the Target:

8.4.1.1 The sensitive subjects list is maintained current.

8.4.1.2 Reporting requirements related to Counterintelligence (CI), including trip reports are met on time.

8.4.1.3 Laboratory reports are made promptly, within 24 to 48 hours, to the CH CI Office or the local FBI of any contacts or elicitation attempts with people of any nationality who seek sensitive unclassified information (e.g., proprietary or CRADA information) without proper authorization

by any means. This includes any compromising situation or other inconsistencies associated with foreign travel or a visit or assignment.

8.4.1.4 Counterintelligence awareness training materials are provided effectively to staff in accordance with the requirements of DOE O 475.1.

8.4.1.5 Hosts of Sensitive Country foreign nationals are knowledgeable with the background, current status, and progress of the work being done by the foreign national during the period of the assignment. Briefings and debriefings (by DOE) of hosts will demonstrate that this is true.

8.4.1.6 Suspicious unsolicited e-mail and unsolicited resumes (to the extent possible), and other suspicious cyber contact are reported to the Chicago Regional Office (CRO) Counterintelligence Office are reported in a high quality and timely manner. An Ames Laboratory e-mail account is set up that forwards unsolicited e-mail to Ames Cyber Security and CI points of contact. Training and awareness of the types of e-mail Ames Cyber Security and CI may be interested in is provided to all employees, with information furnished to the user on how to capture the header information.

ELEMENT	Letter Grade	Numerical Score	Objective Weight	Total Points	Total Points
8.0 Sustain and Enhance the Effectiveness of Integrated Safeguards and Security Management (ISSM)					
8.1 Provide an Efficient and Effective Emergency Management System			35%		
8.2 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for Cyber-Security			45%		
8.3 Provide an Efficient and Effective System for the Protection of Special Nuclear Materials, Classified Matter, and Property			10%		
8.4 Provide an Efficient and Effective CI System for the Protection of Classified and Sensitive Information			10%		
Performance Goal 8.0 Total					

Table 8.1 – 8.0 Goal Performance Rating Development

Final Grade	A+	A	A-	B+	B	B-	C+	C	C-	D	F
Total Score	4.3 - 4.1	4.0 - 3.8	3.7 - 3.5	3.4 - 3.1	3.0 - 2.8	2.7 - 2.5	2.4 - 2.1	2.0 - 1.8	1.7 - 1.1	1.0 – 0.8	0.7 – 0.0

Table 8.2 - Goal 8.0 Final Letter Grade Scale

ATTACHMENT I

OFFICE OF SCIENCE PROGRAM OFFICE GOAL & OBJECTIVE WEIGHTINGS

	BER	ASCR	BES	WDTS
Goal's weight	**Weight 75**	**Weight 80%**	**Weight 65%**	**Weight 65**
1a. Impact (significance)	30	40%	50%	25
1b. Leadership (recognition of S&T accomplishments)	20	30%	20%	30
1c. Output (productivity) (pass/fail)	20	15%	15%	30
1d. Delivery (pass/fail)	30	15%	15%	15
check sum **Goal's weight**	100 **0**	100 **0**	100 **0**	100 **0**
2a. Design of Facility (the initiation phase and the definition phase, i.e. activities leading up to CD-2)	0	0	0	0
2b. Construction of Facility/Fabrication of Components (execution phase, Post CD-2 to CD-4)	0	0	0	0
2c. Operation of Facility	0	0	0	0
2d. Utilization of Facility to Grow and Support Lab's Research Base	0	0	0	0
check sum **Goal's weight**	0 **25**	0 **20%**	0 **35%**	0 **35**
3a. Stewardship of Scientific Capabilities and Programmatic Vision	20	30%	40%	20
3b. Program Planning and Management	30	40%	30%	40
3.c Program Management-Communication & Responsiveness (to HQ)	50	30%	30%	40
check sum	100	100	100	100
Goal check sum				

ATTACHMENT II. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

10/01/2008	Effective Start Date for 2009 PEMP.
11/14/2008	The Contractor submits FY 2008 Annual Self-Assessment to AMSO Manager.
1/14/2009	Annual Appraisal Meeting & Presentation to SC-1.
2/2/2009	Approved Performance Evaluation Report and Incentive determination issued to Contractor.
2/16/2009	FY 2008 Report Cards Published on SC Website.
04/30/2009	The Contractor reports (self-assessment) to DOE on mid-year status for FY 2009.
09/30/2009	The evaluation period for FY2009 ends
10/01/2009	Effective Start Date for 2010 PEMP.
11/14/2009	The Contractor submits FY 2009 Annual Self-Assessment to AMSO Manager.